

founded upon, equality, freedom and democracy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MANAGED CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago the Republicans defeated President Clinton's health care reform bill. They claimed it would allow the Federal Government to interfere with the doctor-patient relationship. Yet when the same relationship was threatened by a corporate bureaucracy, Republicans last year offered legislation that did nothing to protect the sanctity of choices made by doctors and their patients.

It is the same story in the 106th Congress. Democrats have been waiting 2 years to pass the Patients' Bill of Rights. Right now we are ready to work to improve Americans' access to quality health care. Right now, today, we are ready to make consumer protections real for all Americans. Although many States have passed legislation making patchwork protections State-by-State, this patchwork does not provide a good fix for over 160 million Americans, Americans who need health care reform.

While there are many fine managed care organizations in my own district, and they are good, Sonoma and Marin Counties, California, on the leading edge of health care reform, too many horror stories are all too well known across this country. Doctors tell us real-life horror stories about how they are gagged by insurance companies that dictate what they can tell their patients about treatment options. They tell us that a patient's treatment decisions are often overruled by a clerk and that patients are denied a specialist's care. Or they tell us that patients are shuttled out of a hospital before recovery is complete.

Americans know better. They want better treatment. Americans are demanding that the Republican leadership take real action on health care reform. But instead, the Republican legislation does not ensure that patients have the right to even see a specialist. Nor does it prevent insurance companies from continuing to send women who receive mastectomies home early, against the advice of their physician. Lastly, under the Republicans' bill, if patients are denied care, they would not have the right to a meaningful external appeal. In other words, they will not be able to sue.

In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, the Republican bill will do little to prevent medical decisions from being made by insurance company clerks instead of by doctors and their patients.

What our health care system needs is the Democratic Patients' Bill of Rights. This legislation will make sure that doctors and patients are free to make decisions about patient health. The Patients' Bill of Rights will ensure that patients have the right to openly discuss with doctors their treatment options, have the right to receive uniform information about their health plan, have the right to go to the emergency room when the need arises, have the right to see a specialist, and seek remedy from the courts when claims have been unfairly denied.

It is time to put doctors and patients back in charge of our health care system. I urge the Speaker and my colleagues to support the Patients' Bill of Rights. I plead with the Republican leadership to bring HMO health care reform to the House floor for debate.

CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE IN DEALING WITH KOSOVO ISSUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, over the last month this Congress could not have been more irresponsible in the way it has dealt with the issue in Kosovo if it had taken lessons. I would like to walk through with you the quaint way in which this institution has stumbled through its way through its efforts to try to deal with our constitutional responsibilities.

First of all, it gratuitously decided to vote on the question of whether or not the President could use peacekeepers in Kosovo. That is not a constitutional prerogative of the Congress. The President as Commander in Chief has the prerogative of deciding where to use troops in noncombat situations.

Then, having gratuitously decided to support the placement of those peacekeepers in Kosovo, when the war began this institution then did not step up to its responsibilities to vote on whether or not the combat should proceed. The Senate did. They passed, I believe, the McCain-Warner motion which indicated their support for the ongoing military operation in Kosovo.

Then, further compounding its backwards approach to this issue, this House decided today that it was going to stipulate that under no circumstances could ground troops be used in Kosovo. Again, that is not a congressional prerogative. Once you are in a combat situation, it is the President and his military advisers who have the constitutional obligation to determine what the best way is to proceed militarily, whether it is through the use of ground forces, whether it is through the use of air power, whether it is through the use of

naval power or a combination of the three.

The Congress has the right and an obligation to address the question of whether military activity should proceed, but when they are proceeding it has no right to try to micromanage the combat situations. That is a responsibility of our military leaders and the President.

Then, having compounded the confusion by gratuitously getting involved in that issue, it then proceeded to turn down, by one vote, the endorsement of the McCain-Warner language, good bipartisan language with Republican leadership in the other body. It then turned down our obligation to support troops in the field. I just find the way this institution has approached this to be mind-boggling.

And now, tomorrow, after they have turned down their authorization for what is going on in Kosovo, we will be marking up the supplemental appropriation bill in the Committee on Appropriations. And guess what? The same crowd that voted "no" on authorizing this military operation today will be going into that committee and demanding that we double the amount of money that the President asked to spend on it, taking it from \$6 billion to over \$13 billion and creating an opportunity to pork up the next year's defense bill in the process.

Never, never in the 30 years that I have served here have I seen less vision. Never have I seen less leadership. Never have I seen more confusion. And never have I seen the national interest being left in the dust the way it is tonight. I want to see how many Members of the majority party who today voted against authorizing this operation will tomorrow then demand that we double the amount of spending for the supplemental. It is very clear to me, based on the votes taken here today, that that supplemental appropriation is dead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GANSKE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHADEGG addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)